

When Dimensionality Hurts: The Role of LLM Embedding Compression for Noisy Regression Tasks

Felix Drinkall*, Janet B. Pierrehumbert*‡, Stefan Zohren*

*Department of Engineering Science, University of Oxford

‡Faculty of Linguistics, University of Oxford

felix.drinkall@eng.ox.ac.uk

Abstract

Large language models (LLMs) have shown remarkable success in language modelling due to scaling laws found in model size and the hidden dimension of the model’s text representation. Yet, we demonstrate that compressed representations of text can yield better performance in LLM-based regression tasks. In this paper, we compare the relative performance of embedding compression in three different signal-to-noise contexts: financial return prediction, writing quality assessment and review scoring. Our results show that compressing embeddings, in a minimally supervised manner using an autoencoder’s hidden representation, can mitigate overfitting and improve performance on noisy tasks, such as financial return prediction; but that compression reduces performance on tasks that have high causal dependencies between the input and target data. Our results suggest that the success of interpretable compressed representations such as sentiment may be due to a regularising effect.

1 Introduction

Modern machine learning research increasingly relies on LLMs to handle complex real-world tasks (Lin et al., 2025; Rahimikia and Drinkall, 2024; Huang et al., 2024). Recent progress in LLM performance has largely come from scaling models’ parameters, training dataset size and the expressivity of the LLM via the model’s hidden dimension (Kaplan et al., 2020). In recent years the hidden dimension has scaled from a standard representation size of 768 dimensions (Devlin et al., 2019) to up to 16384 (Grattafiori et al., 2024), and possibly higher in some large closed-source models. While it is not clear whether the relationship between model scaling and linguistic performance will hold indefinitely (Xue et al., 2023), it is generally accepted that modelling language requires a high-dimensional representation space (Grattafiori et al., 2024). This has meant that LLMs have very

strong formal linguistic competence (Mahowald et al., 2024). However, some machine learning tasks, like stock returns prediction tasks, have inherently low signal-to-noise relationships between the input and output (Sawhney et al., 2020), which we will refer to as “noisy” tasks in this paper. In the case of predicting stock returns from news, noise arises not only from uninformative articles or weak causality between the article and the stock price but can also come from delayed reactions, market efficiency, and unpredictable macroeconomic influences (Antweiler and Frank, 2004; Mantilla-García and Vaidyanathan, 2017). In such noisy research areas, the link between dimensionality and performance is unclear, and feature selection or compression can act as a regularising component (Tian and Zhang, 2022). When input dimensionality is too large, models risk overfitting by memorising noise rather than learning meaningful patterns. On the other hand, a low-dimensional embedding might underfit by losing critical high-order interactions. This paper explores the relationship between text-embedding dimensionality and downstream performance in tasks where the signal is noisy, focusing on a stock returns prediction task.

Not all tasks are well-suited to purely generative LLMs; many tasks benefit more from supervised machine learning (Tang et al., 2024), where labelled data guide classification or regression outcomes by identifying robust dependencies between input text and target outputs (Johan Berggren et al., 2019). Generative models often require extensive computational resources and large datasets (Hoffmann et al., 2022), creating obstacles under computational or data constraints. Problems also emerge when using the output from generative models in larger architectures that fuse textual data with other modalities, such as numerical or structured information (Drinkall et al., 2025), since generative models can produce unpredictable outputs (Wu et al., 2022) and are relatively weak at complex

numerical reasoning (Liu et al., 2024). As such, it is often preferable to use the embedding representations from LLMs as input features for a conventional neural network in regression-based tasks as opposed to passing all of the numerical and textual data into a prompt.

There have been papers that have investigated how well text embeddings perform in regression tasks (Tang et al., 2024), but none have investigated the degree to which the noise of a task affects the optimal dimensionality of the text representation. This is despite the widespread adoption and success of interpretable, compressed representations of text in financial return prediction tasks like sentiment (Fazlija and Harder, 2022), emotion (Tilly et al., 2021), and topics (Drinkall et al., 2022; García-Méndez et al., 2023). While many papers have shown that these compressed representations can perform better than raw text embeddings, this paper investigates the degree to which this is due to regularisation rather than the true value of the features. We consider the internal representation from an autoencoder, and show that interpretable features such as sentiment or emotion do not deliver an improvement beyond text representation compression to a more optimal dimensionality.

This paper has the following contributions:

1. Providing some evidence for a link between the optimal representational dimensionality of text in a regression task and the signal-to-noise ratio of the dataset.
2. Demonstrating that gains attributed to interpretable features (e.g., emotion, sentiment) in financial returns tasks may primarily stem from representational compression, rather than from inherently superior feature sets.
3. Identifying the optimal compression dimensionality of text representation in a financial returns task.
4. A financial news stock returns dataset¹ released under an academic license which can be used for benchmarking purposes.

2 Datasets

To explore the relationship between the signal-to-noise ratio and the optimal dimensionality of the

¹<https://github.com/FelixDrinkall/financial-news-dataset/>

text representation in a regression task, we compare three domains of conceivable regression tasks. Stock market return prediction using news articles is a notoriously noisy domain (Black, 1986) since a significant proportion of the news articles are likely to not contain any useful information (Antweiler and Frank, 2004). We contrast this noisy domain to customer review and essay marking datasets, which both have a very strong connection between the regression input and the target value.

2.1 Stock Returns Dataset

We combine two data sources to form the dataset: CRSP daily price data² and news articles. For the 50 most traded U.S. stocks, we use the closing bid/ask average as the daily price. Given the previous day’s closing price p_{t-1} and the next day’s closing price p_{t+1} , the daily return is defined as:

$$r_t = \frac{p_{t+1} - p_{t-1}}{p_{t-1}}.$$

This return r_t serves as the regression model’s target. We use the next and previous day’s data as opposed to the current day’s price data so that we can be sure that the publication of the article intersected the two prices, and thus avoid including samples where the article was published after the market’s closing time. The underlying assumption is that the news content is either causing or reflecting the observed price change.

We source news articles via CommonCrawl News³ (Hamborg et al., 2017), scraping articles from Yahoo Finance. Using a pre-trained named entity recognition BERT model (Tjong Kim Sang and De Meulder, 2003; Devlin et al., 2019), we extract all mentioned organizations, then filter them through a dictionary of company abbreviations to identify target companies. We then apply another filter to make sure that only one of the target companies is mentioned in each sample to reduce the noise slightly. The size and split for the datasets are reported in Appendix A.1.

2.2 High Signal Datasets

To compare the degree to which noise affects the optimal dimensionality of a task we selected a dataset with a high causal dependency between the input data and target information. Written product reviews are directly linked to the score assigned to the review, therefore we use the following datasets:

²<https://tinyurl.com/mrxsfdhu>

³<https://commoncrawl.org/>

from Yelp (Zhang et al., 2015), App Reviews⁴ and Amazon Reviews (McAuley and Leskovec, 2013). Writing quality is a more ambiguous task but there is still a direct link between the input text and the target which also makes it a good candidate for comparison against more noisy tasks – as such we use the ELL English Grading dataset (Franklin et al., 2022). Details of each dataset are in Appendix A.

3 Methodology

Given the success of generative LLMs, much of the recent research on downstream tasks has focused on how to use LLMs in a prompting setting (Chang et al., 2024). However, there are some domains where encoder-based LLMs are better suited: embedding tasks have been dominated by LLMs pre-trained with bi-directional attention (Song et al., 2020) or uni-directional attention followed by bi-directional fine-tuning (Lee et al., 2024; BehnamGhader et al., 2024). Likewise, recent work shows that generative models perform worse on word meaning comprehension than encoder-based LLMs (Qorib et al., 2024). As such, we encode the textual information using *allmpnet-base-v2* (Song et al., 2020; Reimers and Gurevych, 2019), an encoder-based model fine-tuned using a contrastive objective function on a series of sentence similarity tasks. The model is widely used and competitive on the MTEB benchmark (Muennighoff et al., 2023).

3.1 Input Processing and Chunking

Each textual input x is tokenized into a sequence of tokens (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_L) . To handle variable-length inputs, we split the token sequence into M chunks, each of length at most C , where C is the maximum context window of the model. If the final chunk is shorter than C , it is padded; similarly, sequences with fewer than M chunks are padded, ensuring each batch element has uniform shape $[M, C]$. After chunking, we pass the sequences through a pre-trained language model to produce token-level embeddings, and then mean-pool across the final layer token representations of all of the chunks to produce $\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{\text{LLM}}}$. Where d_{LLM} is the size of the LLM’s hidden dimension. The target features are standardized to enable easier interpretation.

⁴<https://tinyurl.com/427hnu6c>

3.2 Dimensionality Reduction

To obtain a lower-dimensional representation, we train an autoencoder consisting of an encoder $E : \mathbb{R}^{d_{\text{LLM}}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_z}$ and a decoder $D : \mathbb{R}^{d_z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_{\text{LLM}}}$, where d_z is the size of the autoencoder’s hidden dimension:

$$\mathbf{z}_i = E(\mathbf{v}_i), \quad \hat{\mathbf{v}}_i = D(\mathbf{z}_i).$$

The autoencoder is trained to minimize:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{AE}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{v}_i - \hat{\mathbf{v}}_i\|^2.$$

The training runs for 100 epochs with early stopping if validation loss does not improve for 5 epochs. After training, we use E to compress all embeddings \mathbf{v}_i into $\mathbf{z}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_z}$ and vary d_z to identify the optimal compression ratio.

The dimensionality reduction methodology in this section is benchmarked against more interpretable techniques that are widely used in stock returns tasks such as emotion and sentiment scores. We take the softmax outputs from fine-tuned DistilRoBERTa models that have been fine-tuned on sentiment and emotion classification tasks^{5 6} and pass the class probabilities into the regression model. This enables us to compare their relative performance against the autoencoder latent features to infer the degree to which their strong performance is due to regularisation or valuable feature selection.

3.3 Regression Model

For the regression model, we use a random forest model as it is robust, lightweight and widely used (Breiman, 2001; Roy and Larocque, 2012), which simplifies the experimental setup so that focus can be directed to the compression methodology. For the same reason we use the default parameters and do not vary them between runs. We also tried a two-layer MLP layer in line with Tang et al. (2024) (Appendix C), but the inadequate overall performance and high variance in prediction errors meant that no statistically significant conclusions could be drawn.

4 Results

We report the results using a Huber loss function (Huber, 1964) since it is robust to outliers while

⁵Emotion: <https://tinyurl.com/mrxxnuft>

⁶Sentiment: <https://tinyurl.com/3upb7zyw>




Figure 1: Huber Loss on the noisy financial returns task for different autoencoder latent dimensions d_z . The performance of **sentiment** and **emotion** representations also appear inline with their respective dimensionality. The significance of each result compared to the best latent dimension is displayed using **blue** ($p > .05$), **orange** ($p < .01$) and **yellow** ($p < .05$) colours.

maintaining sensitivity to small errors, whereas Mean Squared Error (MSE) is often dominated by the performance of outliers. The Huber threshold between L1 and L2 loss that we use is 1. The significance level of $d_z = x$ is determined using a T-Test (Student, 1908) between the Huber error distributions of the best performing latent dimension d_z^* and $d_z = x$.

By varying the hidden dimension of the autoencoder d_z and then passing the input into our regression model, Figure 1 shows that the optimal dimensionality on the financial returns task is 8, but that there is not a statistically significant difference between a $d_z = 8$ and $d_z \in \{4, 16, 32\}$. There is also a significant difference between $d_z = 8$ and $d_z \in \{1, 2, 128, 256, 512\}$. The result shows us that the optimal dimensionality is significantly less than d_{LLM} , showing that for this noisy task some dimensionality reduction is necessary.

Figure 1 also reports the performance of compressing the text representation into a class probability vector of different semantic and emotion categories. Both representations do not exceed the expected performance of the autoencoder features at their respective dimensions d_z . Despite the reported success of emotion and sentiment features in similar tasks (Tilly et al., 2021; Fazlija and Harder, 2022) the findings of this work suggest that most of this performance improvement can be explained due to the regularising effect of dimensionality reduction rather than the inherent value of the features.




Figure 2: Huber loss averaged over **Review**, **English Writing**, and **Financial Returns** tasks - granular performance in Appendix B. To display the results on one axis, the y-axis represents the error rate of each individual task as a percentage of the maximum and minimum error on that task. The performance without any compression is marked with the dashed line.

4.1 Impact of Noise

To compare the degree to which noise affects the optimal dimensionality of a task we test our methodology on tasks from different domains. Figure 2 shows that for the financial returns task, there is a convex relationship between performance and dimensionality, whereas the relationship approximates a negative exponential in tasks with a strong signal; the performance does not deteriorate for high dimensional inputs. The large difference in error distributions between the different tasks suggests that input dimensionality is a key parameter for regression-based tasks.

Also of note is that in all domains the performance reaches 10% of the minimum loss at a much lower dimension than d_{LLM} . We will call the dimension at which this performance is achieved the "intrinsic dimension", which for the Review and the English Writing tasks is 8 and 32 respectively. This suggests that the pertinent signals for regression tasks in general can be compressed to a lower dimension space and still achieve strong performance. For any architectures which have poor time complexity as a function of input length, this is an important finding.

5 Conclusion

Our results suggest that the optimal dimensionality is dependent on the signal-to-noise ratio, exposing the necessity of feature compression in high-

noise environments. The implication of the result is that researchers should consider the noise of a task when making decisions about the dimensionality of text. In particular, the results highlight the importance of dimensionality reduction in financial returns prediction tasks, with an optimal autoencoder latent dimension of $d_z = 8$. The lack of statistical significance for $d_z \in \{4, 16, 32\}$ suggests some flexibility in choosing the dimensionality, while extreme values lead to significant performance deterioration. Additionally, the findings indicate that sentiment and emotion-based representations do not provide inherent advantages over learned latent features, implying that their previous success in similar tasks may be attributed to regularisation effects rather than intrinsic informativeness.

6 Future Work

Future research could explore adaptive dimensionality compression methods that dynamically adjust based on the signal-to-noise ratio; however, to do this, a measure of signal-to-noise is required before processing the input features. Researchers could also use this framework to assess the relative performance of new text encoding methodologies in regression tasks to make sure that the value does not just come from model regularisation. It would be desirable to further explore the unsupervised autoencoder features and the more classic emotion features in more downstream settings.

7 Limitations

Although our findings demonstrate the importance of reducing dimensionality in high-noise tasks, several limitations should be noted. Firstly, the paper does not explore other ways of compressing the text representations. PCA, t-SNE, UMAP (van der Maaten and Hinton, 2008; McInnes et al., 2018) are all options for dimensionality compression. This current version of the paper does not provide comparisons with these techniques, but we will provide the comparison in future versions of this paper. Secondly, while the experiments include multiple domains for high-signal datasets, the study focuses on a specific financial returns dataset with a single definition of “noisy” data; future work could explore a broader range of domains. Thirdly, while we aimed to keep the modelling process simple to not distract from the main thrust of the paper - data compression methods - the findings are only reported for one model.

Acknowledgements

The first author was funded by the Economic and Social Research Council of the UK via the Grand Union DTP. This work was supported in part by a grant from the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EP/T023333/1). We are also grateful to the Oxford-Man Institute of Quantitative Finance and the Oxford e-Research Centre for their support.

References

- Werner Antweiler and Murray Z Frank. 2004. [Is All That Talk Just Noise? The Information Content of Internet Stock Message Boards](#). *The Journal of Finance*.
- Parishad BehnamGhader, Vaibhav Adlakha, Marius Mosbach, Dzmitry Bahdanau, Nicolas Chapados, and Siva Reddy. 2024. [LLM2Vec: Large Language Models Are Secretly Powerful Text Encoders](#). In *First Conference on Language Modeling*.
- Fischer Black. 1986. [Noise](#). *The Journal of Finance*, 41(3):528–543.
- L. Breiman. 2001. [Random Forests](#). *Machine Learning*, 45:5–32.
- Kaiyan Chang, Songcheng Xu, Chenglong Wang, Yingfeng Luo, Xiaoqian Liu, Tong Xiao, and Jingbo Zhu. 2024. [Efficient Prompting Methods for Large Language Models: A Survey](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2404.01077.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. [BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*.
- Felix Drinkall, Janet B. Pierrehumbert, and Stefan Zohren. 2025. [Forecasting Credit Ratings: A Case Study where Traditional Methods Outperform Generative LLMs](#). In *Proceedings of the FinNLP-FNP-LLMFinLegal Workshop @ COLING 2025*. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Felix Drinkall, Stefan Zohren, and Janet Pierrehumbert. 2022. [Forecasting COVID-19 Caseloads Using Unsupervised Embedding Clusters of Social Media Posts](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Bledar Fazlija and Pedro Harder. 2022. [Using Financial News Sentiment for Stock Price Direction Prediction](#). *Mathematics*, 10(13).

- Alex Franklin, Maggie, Meg Benner, Natalie Rambis, Perpetual Baffour, Ryan Holbrook, Scott Crossley, and Ulrich Boser. 2022. [Feedback Prize - English Language Learning](#).
- Silvia García-Méndez, Francisco de Arriba-Pérez, Ana Barros-Vila, Francisco J. González-Castaño, and Enrique Costa-Montenegro. 2023. [Automatic Detection of Relevant Information, Predictions and Forecasts in Financial News Through Topic Modelling with Latent Dirichlet Allocation](#). *Applied Intelligence*.
- Aaron Grattafiori, Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, et al. 2024. [The Llama 3 Herd of Models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2407.21783.
- Felix Hamborg, Norman Meuschke, Corinna Breitingner, and Bela Gipp. 2017. [news-please: A Generic News Crawler and Extractor](#). In *Proceedings of the 15th International Symposium of Information Science*, pages 218–223.
- Jordan Hoffmann, Sebastian Borgeaud, Arthur Mensch, et al. 2022. [Training Compute-optimal Large Language Models](#). In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS '22*, Red Hook, NY, USA. Curran Associates Inc.
- Baizhou Huang, Shuai Lu, Xiaojun Wan, and Nan Duan. 2024. [Enhancing Large Language Models in Coding Through Multi-Perspective Self-Consistency](#). In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1429–1450, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Peter J. Huber. 1964. [Robust Estimation of a Location Parameter](#). *Annals of Statistics*, 53(1):73–101.
- Stig Johan Berggren, Taraka Rama, and Lilja Øvrelid. 2019. [Regression or Classification? Automated Essay Scoring for Norwegian](#). In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Workshop on Innovative Use of NLP for Building Educational Applications*, pages 92–102, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Tom Henighan, Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Chess, Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, and Dario Amodei. 2020. [Scaling Laws for Neural Language Models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2001.08361.
- Chankyu Lee, Rajarshi Roy, Mengyao Xu, Jonathan Raiman, Mohammad Shoeybi, Bryan Catanzaro, and Wei Ping. 2024. [NV-Embed: Improved Techniques for Training LLMs as Generalist Embedding Models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2405.17428.
- Fangru Lin, Emanuele La Malfa, Valentin Hofmann, Elle Michelle Yang, Anthony G. Cohn, and Janet B. Pierrehumbert. 2025. [Graph-enhanced Large Language Models in Asynchronous Plan Reasoning](#). In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML'24*. JMLR.org.
- Xiao Liu, Zirui Wu, Xueqing Wu, Pan Lu, Kai-Wei Chang, and Yansong Feng. 2024. [Are LLMs Capable of Data-based Statistical and Causal Reasoning? Benchmarking Advanced Quantitative Reasoning with Data](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 9215–9235, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kyle Mahowald, Anna A. Ivanova, Idan A. Blank, Nancy Kanwisher, Joshua B. Tenenbaum, and Evelina Fedorenko. 2024. [Dissociating Language and Thought in Large Language Models](#). *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 28(6):517–540.
- Daniel Mantilla-García and Varadharajan Vaidyanathan. 2017. [Predicting Stock Returns in the Presence of Uncertain Structural Changes and Sample Noise](#). *Financial Markets and Portfolio Management*, 31.
- J. McAuley and J. Leskovec. 2013. [From Amateurs to Connoisseurs: Modeling the Evolution of User Expertise Through Online Reviews](#). In *Proceedings of the 22nd International Conference on World Wide Web (WWW)*, pages 897–908. ACM.
- L. McInnes, J. Healy, and J. Melville. 2018. [UMAP: Uniform Manifold Approximation and Projection for Dimension Reduction](#). *ArXiv e-prints*.
- Niklas Muennighoff, Nouamane Tazi, Loic Magne, and Nils Reimers. 2023. [MTEB: Massive Text Embedding Benchmark](#). In *Proceedings of the 17th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, Dubrovnik, Croatia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Muhammad Qorib, Geonsik Moon, and Hwee Tou Ng. 2024. [Are Decoder-Only Language Models Better than Encoder-Only Language Models in Understanding Word Meaning?](#) In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 16339–16347, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Eghbal Rahimikia and Felix Drinkall. 2024. [Re \(Visiting\) Large Language Models in Finance](#). *Available at SSRN*.
- Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. [Sentence-BERT: Sentence embeddings using Siamese BERT-networks](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 3982–3992, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Marie-Hélène Roy and Denis Larocque. 2012. [Robustness of Random Forests for Regression](#). *Journal of Nonparametric Statistics*, 24(4):993–1006.
- Ramit Sawhney, Shivam Agarwal, Arnav Wadhwa, and Rajiv Ratn Shah. 2020. [Deep Attentive Learning for Stock Movement Prediction From Social Media Text and Company Correlations](#). In *Proceedings of the*

2020 *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 8415–8426. Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Kaitao Song, Xu Tan, Tao Qin, Jianfeng Lu, and Tie-Yan Liu. 2020. [MPNet: Masked and Permuted Pre-training for Language Understanding](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 16857–16867. Curran Associates, Inc.

Student. 1908. [The Probable Error of a Mean](#). *Biometrika*, pages 1–25.

Eric Tang, Bangding Yang, and Xingyou Song. 2024. [Understanding LLM Embeddings for Regression](#). Preprint, arXiv:2411.14708.

Yingjie Tian and Yuqi Zhang. 2022. [A Comprehensive Survey on Regularization Strategies in Machine Learning](#). *Information Fusion*, 80:146–166.

Sonja Tilly, Markus Ebner, and Giacomo Livan. 2021. [Macroeconomic Forecasting Through News, Emotions and Narrative](#). *Expert Systems with Applications*, 175:114760.

Erik F. Tjong Kim Sang and Fien De Meulder. 2003. [Introduction to the CoNLL-2003 Shared Task: Language-Independent Named Entity Recognition](#). In *Proceedings of the Seventh Conference on Natural Language Learning at HLT-NAACL 2003*.

Laurens van der Maaten and Geoffrey Hinton. 2008. [Visualizing Data using t-SNE](#). *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 9(86):2579–2605.

Tongshuang Wu, Michael Terry, and Carrie Jun Cai. 2022. [AI Chains: Transparent and Controllable Human-AI Interaction by Chaining Large Language Model Prompts](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, CHI '22, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.

Fuzhao Xue, Yao Fu, Wangchunshu Zhou, Zangwei Zheng, and Yang You. 2023. [To Repeat or Not To Repeat: Insights from Scaling LLM Under Token-crisis](#). In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, NIPS '23, Red Hook, NY, USA. Curran Associates Inc.

Xiang Zhang, Junbo Zhao, and Yann LeCun. 2015. [Character-level Convolutional Networks for Text Classification](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Curran Associates, Inc.

A Dataset Details

A.1 Stock Returns Dataset

As outlined in the main section of the paper, this dataset was curated for this paper. Most of the dataset details are outlined in Section 2.1, but this section contains the details that are missing. The

test set is the whole of 2023, which contains 17,810 articles, and the training and validation set are defined using a temporal split which takes the last 10% of data between 2017 and 2022. The resultant training and validation sets contain 30,115 and 3,346 samples respectively.

A.2 Yelp Reviews Dataset

The Yelp dataset (Zhang et al., 2015) consists of 700k Yelp reviews with a star rating between 1 and 5. There are 650k training samples and 50k testing samples, and the split is taken from the Huggingface dataset `Yelp/yelp_review_full`.

A.3 App Reviews Dataset

This App Review dataset contains reviews of 395 Android applications, covering 629 versions. It provides the review and the star rating between 1 and 5, and user-reported issues in English. The dataset consists of 288k samples and we perform a random train-val-test split of 85.5:4.5:10.

A.4 Amazon Reviews Dataset

The Amazon Reviews dataset (McAuley and Leskovec, 2013) consists of 568k fine food reviews collected from Amazon over a period of more than 10 years, up to October 2012. Each review includes a product ID, user ID, profile name, rating (1–5), helpfulness votes, timestamp, summary, and full text. The data came from the Huggingface dataset `jhan21/amazon-food-reviews-dataset`, which did not contain any predefined train-test splits so we performed a random train-test split of 85.5:4.5:10.

A.5 Writing Quality Dataset

The writing quality dataset (Franklin et al., 2022) comes from a Kaggle competition set up by Vanderbilt University. The competition aimed to improve automated feedback tools for English Language Learners (ELLs) by developing language proficiency models using real student essays. The dataset assesses English text over six criteria: cohesion, syntax, vocabulary, phraseology, grammar and conventions. We report the results of cohesion, vocabulary, and grammar. The dataset consists of 3.91k samples and we perform a random train-val-test split of 85.5:4.5:10.

B Individual Dataset Results

Figure 3 shows the performance of each dataset that makes up the averaged result in Figure 2.




Figure 3: The normalised Huber loss of each dataset that makes up the result in Figure 2. "raw" appears in the same location as 768 in the plot since this is the dimension of the non-compressed embedding.

C MLP

The configuration for the unsuccessful MLP is outlined in this section. The model was not able to learn the financial returns task for any dimensional input. We believe that this negative result will aid other researchers in this area. The compressed embeddings \mathbf{z}_i serve as inputs to an MLP with hidden dimension d_{mlp} :

$$\mathbf{h}^{(1)} = \mathcal{D}_p(\sigma(W^{(1)}\mathbf{z}_i + \mathbf{b}^{(1)})),$$

$$\mathbf{h}^{(2)} = \mathcal{D}_p(\sigma(W^{(2)}\mathbf{h}^{(1)} + \mathbf{b}^{(2)})),$$

$$\hat{y}_i = W^{(3)}\mathbf{h}^{(2)} + \mathbf{b}^{(3)},$$

where $\mathbf{z}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_z}$, $W^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{\text{mlp}} \times d_z}$, and $W^{(2)}, W^{(3)}$ similarly match the required dimensions. Dropout $\mathcal{D}_p(\cdot)$ is applied with probability p , and $\sigma(\cdot)$ is the ReLU activation. We optimize the Huber loss with $\delta = 1.0$:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{reg}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \text{HuberLoss}(y_i, \hat{y}_i, \delta).$$

Most targets y_i are close to zero, so we apply target standardisation and stop training when validation loss does not improve for 5 epochs, restoring the best model state.

D Autoencoder Visualisation

Downstream performance on regression tasks provides insight into the quality of the autoencoder's compression. However, Figure 4 offers a more direct comparison between the autoencoder's input and output embeddings, \mathbf{v}_i and $\hat{\mathbf{v}}_i$, respectively. The figure displays the cosine similarity between the raw (\mathbf{v}_i) and reconstructed ($\hat{\mathbf{v}}_i$) embeddings for different hidden dimensions. The graph provides us with a further understanding of the reconstructive process; it seems that a $d_z = 256$ is the point at which performance reaches an asymptote. It also implies that there is some semantic loss at the optimal dimensions in Figure 2.




Figure 4: Cosine similarity between \mathbf{v}_i and $\hat{\mathbf{v}}_i$ on the financial returns dataset.